

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-8 and 10-14 are currently pending, wherein claims 2 and 9 have been canceled and claims 1, 6, and 10 have been amended to include the subject matter of canceled claim 2. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein below.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to claims 1, 6, and 10 for allegedly containing an incorrect limitation. Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion, in order to expedite prosecution, claims 1, 6, and 10 have been amended to remove the limitation in question. As a result, this rejection is rendered moot.

On page 2 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly being based on a disclosure which is not enabling. Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion, in order to expedite prosecution, claim 9 has been canceled. As a result, this rejection is rendered moot.

On page 4 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art ("ARA") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,305,129 to Fujiwara et al. ("Fujiwara"), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963,284 to Jones et al. ("Jones"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In order to support a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Action must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some motivation to combine the applied references. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the combination must teach each and every claimed element. Claims 1, 3-5 and 8 are not rendered unpatentable by the combination of

ARA, Fujiwara and Jones for at least the reasons that the combination fails to disclose or suggest each and every claimed feature as discussed below.

Independent claims 1, 6, and 10 have been amended to include the subject matter of canceled claim 2. More specifically, claims 1, 6, and 10 have been amended to include that the shape, size and distribution of the protrusions are controlled to make a distribution of reflected light be uniform within a viewing angle range of about 30 degrees upward and downward from a front direction.

Nowhere in ARA, Fujiwara or Jones, individually or in combination, is there any disclosure or suggestion of controlling the shape, size and distribution of the protrusions to make the distribution of reflected light be uniform within a viewing angle range of approximately 30 degrees upward and downward from a front direction. Accordingly, claims 1, 6, and 10 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of ARA, Fujiwara, and Jones for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element.

Claims 3-5 and 8 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 3-5 and 8 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of ARA, Fujiwara, and Jones for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2-5, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

On page 7 of the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 6, 7, and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over APA in view of Fujiwara, further in view of Jones. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As discussed above, independent claims 1, 6, and 10 have been amended to include the subject matter of canceled claim 2. Furthermore, nowhere in ARA, Fujiwara, or Jones,

individually or in combination, is there any disclosure or suggestion of controlling the shape, size and distribution of the protrusions to make the distribution of reflected light be uniform within a viewing angle range of approximately 30 degrees upward and downward from a front direction. Accordingly, claims 1, 6, and 10 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of ARA, Fujiwara, and Jones for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose each and every claimed element.

Claims 7 and 11-14 variously depend from independent claims 6 and 10. Therefore, claims 7 and 11-14 are patentably distinguishable over the combination of ARA, Fujiwara and Jones for at least those reasons presented above with respect to claims 6 and 10. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6, 7, and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner for any reason find the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: December 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Rebecca Goldman Rudich

Registration No.: 41,786

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

Attorneys for Applicant